DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 194 743 CE 026 980

AUTHOR Phelps, L. Allen: Thornton, L. Jay
TITLE Vocational Education and Handicapped Learners: Perceptions and Inservice Needs of State Leadership Personnel. Policy Research and Resource Series: Document 1.
INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Urbana.: Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Div. of Occupational and Vocational Studies.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Special Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Dec 79
GRANT G007900952
NOTE 49p.: Appended materials will not reproduce well due to small print. For related documents see CE 026 981-982 and CE 027 002-004.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrators: Adult Education: Agency Role: Demonstration Programs: *Disabilities: *Educational Administration: Educational Research: Elementary Secondary Education: *Leadership Training: *Management Development: National Surveys: *Needs Assessment: Postsecondary Education: Special Education: State Agencies: Technical Assistance: *Vocational Education: Vocational Rehabilitation

ABSTRACT

This report presents baseline data describing perceptions and training needs of eight groups of leadership personnel involved in vocational programming for the handicapped. An introduction sets forth the problem--obtaining comprehensive data to assist in planning and development of appropriate inservice technical assistance activities the Leadership Training Institute/Vocational and Special Education Project might offer. (The project's goal is conducting short-term inservice training for state leadership personnel involved in vocational education, special education, and vocational rehabilitation.) A second section describes design and pilot testing of the national needs assessment survey instrument, identification of survey population, and followup activities. The third section first presents composite findings for the three major survey questions: (1) identification of exemplary practices or policies, (2) perceived importance of agencies and organizations involved in development of vocational education opportunities for the handicapped, and (3) identification of leadership training needs. Composite findings are then given for the groups surveyed: State Directors of Vocational Education, State Directors of Special Education, State Directors of Vocational Rehabilitation, professional association officers, State Board of Education members, handicapped advocates and consumers, teacher educators, and State Advisory Councils for Vocational Education. Seven recommendations are presented. Appendixes include composite data tables and the survey instrument. (YLB)

ED194743

Vocational Education and Handicapped Learners: Perceptions and Inservice Needs of State Leadership Personnel

Policy Research and Resource Series: Document 1

L. Allen Phelps
Assistant Professor and Director
Leadership Training Institute/
Vocational and Special Education
University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign

L. Jay Thornton
Instructor
Division of Occupational
and Vocational Studies
The Pennsylvania State University

A Publication of the
**LEADERSHIP TRAINING INSTITUTE/
VOCATIONAL AND SPECIAL EDUCATION**

College of Education
University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign

Division of Occupational
and Vocational Studies
The Pennsylvania State University

Sponsored by

Division of Personnel Preparation
Office of Special Education
U.S. Education Department

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Janet Treichel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

December 1979

CE026980

The contents of this publication were developed under grant number G007900952 from the Division of Personnel Preparation, Office of Special Education, U.S. Education Department. However, these contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the agency, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.

PREFACE

Since 1976 and the passage of Public Laws 94-142 and 94-482, much has been written regarding vocational education opportunities for handicapped persons. A number of barriers exist that prohibit the handicapped from obtaining full access to appropriate vocational education and meaningful and productive employment. Census data from 1970 reveal that, as a result of these barriers, only 42% of the handicapped population is employed, compared to 59% of the total population. In addition, a sizable percentage of the handicapped population is underemployed (Levitan and Taggart, 1977).

A variety of educational effots at the local, state, and national level have been initiated to overcome these barriers. State departments of education have conducted inservice training and curriculum development projects. An increasing number of school districts are expanding their career and vocational programming options for handicapped students at the secondary and elementary levels. Over 100 universities and colleges have established professional education courses focusing on providing new competencies to vocational and special educators.

As a part of these efforts, the Leadership Training Institute/ Vocational and Special Education, University of Illinois is providing short-term inservice training to state leaders from vocational education, special education, and vocational rehabilitation. This report presents important baseline data describing the perceptions and training needs of eight groups of leadership personnel involved in vocational programming for the handicapped. I am certain that you will find the information and recommendations presented herein helpful in planning personnel preparation programs that respond effectively to the vocational and career education needs of America's handicapped youth.

Jasper Harvey, Director
Division of Personnel Preparation
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
U.S. Office of Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1
Overview. 1
The Problem. 3

PROCEDURES 6
Instrument Design and Pilot Testing 6
Identification of Survey Participants 6
Follow-up Activities 7
Major Group Exclusions 8

OUTCOMES 9

Exemplary Practices 9
Perceived Importance of Selected State Agencies . . . 11
Leadership Training Needs 13
State Directors of Vocational Education 17
State Directors of Special Education 18
State Directors of Vocational Rehabilitation. 19
Professional Association Officers 20
State Board of Education Members. 21
Handicapped Advocates and Consumers 22
Teacher Educators. 23
State Advisory Councils for Vocational Education. . . 24

RECOMMENDATIONS. 26

REFERENCES 31

APPENDICES

A. Composite Data Tables 33
B. Survey Instrument 39

INTRODUCTION

Overview

In the past five years there has been a renewed national interest in expanding and improving vocational education opportunities for handicapped learners. As a result of federal and state legislation, litigations, and the efforts of various advocacy groups, there has been a significant concern expressed for the need to provide handicapped learners with an appropriate vocational education in the least restrictive environment. The final rules and regulations for Public Law 94-142 note that (Federal Register, August 23, 1977):

> Each public agency shall take steps to insure that its handicapped children have available to them the variety of educational programs and services available to non-handicapped children in the area served by the agency, including . . . industrial arts, consumer and homemaking education, and vocational education (Section 102a.305, pp. 42488-9).
>
> The definition of special education also includes vocational education if it consists of specially designed instruction, at no cost to the parents, to meet the unique needs of a handicapped child (Section 121a.14, p. 42480).

The final rules and regulations that implement Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 note that (Federal Register, May 4, 1977):

> Subpart D sets forth requirements for non-discrimination (on the basis of handicap) in preschool, elementary, secondary, and adult education programs and activities, including secondary vocational education programs (p. 22690).

Similar concerns were expressed by Congress in the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 (Title II of PL 94-482). These Amendments continue the requirement that states spend at least ten percent of their basic grant for vocational education programs for the handicapped persons, but now requires that these monies be matched equally with

state and local funds. The funds are to be used to assist handicapped persons in participating in regular vocational education programs to the maximum extent possible.

Major strides have also been made in expanding employment opportunities for handicapped persons. Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 insures that affirmative action will be taken by federal contractors to employ, recruit, hire, and train handicapped workers. The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped estimates that nearly half of the private businesses and industries in the U.S. are subject to the Section 503 provisions. A number of major corporations have undertaken expanded recruitment efforts to hire and promote persons with a variety of handicaps.

The Olympus Research Corporation (1974) noted a number of problems in providing vocational education opportunities to the handicapped youth and adults. Among the more significant problems were under-representation of handicapped students in regular vocational classes, and an over-emphasis on prevocational or non-skills training instead of vocational training. A number of other concerns focusing on funding procedures, restricted occupational offerings, state-level interagency coordination, and poor data collection were also cited.

Since the mid-1970's, an overriding and continuous concern has been the lack of professional preparation of vocational educators in serving handicapped youth (General Accounting Office, 1976; Phelps, et al., 1976; Howard, 1979). In response to this concern, more than 80 inservice and preservice training programs have been initiated in nearly every state to train vocational and special education personnel to work with handicapped youth (Griffin, et al., 1978).

Aside from teacher training, the inservice training of other professionals and leadership personnel involved in the development and delivery of vocational education to handicapped learners has been fragmented and limited in scope. Few inservice programs have been designed to assist state and local policymaking personnel to understand the problems of providing appropriate vocational programming for handicapped youth. The Leadership Training Institute (LTI)/Vocational and Special Education Project was created in response to this need. The principal goal of the three-year project focuses on conducting short-term inservice training for state leadership personnel involved in vocational education, special education, and vocational rehabilitation. The LTI target audiences include: state education and rehabilitation agency personnel, professional and advocacy association officers, teacher educators, and members of state advisory panels. A number of activities including regional topical institutes, conferences, policy research studies, and a newsletter are part of the project design. The overall mission of the project is to assist regional and state leaders in formulating effective policies and guidelines to implement appropriate vocational education programming for handicapped learners.

The Problem

To insure that the LTI activities would respond to real and significant probems, a mail survey was designed. Comprehensive data were needed to assist in the planning and development of appropriate inservice and technical assistance activities. The major questions identified for the study were:

1. What exemplary policies and/or practices currently exist in states relative to vocational education for handicapped learners?
2. Which state agencies and organizations are most instrumental in facilitating the development and delivery of vocational education to handicapped learners?
3. What are the specific inservice training needs of state leadership personnel?

A descriptive survey was planned to address these questions. The initial survey population was identified as including state leadership personnel in a variety of roles. Initial consideration was given to surveying Leadership personnel employed by or representing the:

- State director of vocational education
- State director of special education
- State director of vocational rehabilitation
- Professional associations (state vocational associations, state rehabilitation counseling associations, and state federations of the Council for Exceptional Children)
- State board of education
- State advisory councils (Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, State advisory panel on the handicapped, State Advisory Council for Vocational Education, and State Employment and Training Council)
- Advocacy organizations (e.g., state coalitions of citizens with disabilities, state associations of children with learning disabilities)
- University personnel (e.g., teacher educators, rehabilitation counselor educators, researchers)

Since these groups constituted the general target audience for the LTI project, it was determined that an appropriate sample of personnel

representing these agencies and organizations could adequately respond to the research questions identified above.

PROCEDURES

Instrument Design and Pilot Testing

An initial survey instrument containing ten questions was prepared in September, 1978. The initial instrument was reviewed by the project's National Planning and Advisory Committee and project staff at both universities. In addition, feedback regarding item clarity was obtained from 15 selected state leadership personnel representing the survey target audiences. The instrument, in its final version, was given human subjects clearance by the Pennsylvania State University.

As a result of the pilot testing the list of survey questions was reduced to six, and the wording of several items was clarified. A copy of the survey instrument is presented in Appendix B.

Identification of Survey Participants

To identify the names and addresses of potential survey participants, attempts were made to solicit directories of state personnel from several national organizations and federal agencies. Ten directories for the eight major target audiences were obtained from agencies such as the U.S. Office of Education, President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, and the Council for Exceptional Children. Members of the National Planning and Advisory Committee were instrumental in obtaining the directories.

Using each individual directory, approximately 34 leaders from various states were randomly selected. To insure geographic dispersion, approximately 5-6 individuals from each state received the survey

instrument. As noted in Figure 1, a total of 266 surveys were mailed to members of the eight major target audiences in the 50 states.

Figure 1. RESPONSE RATES OF SURVEY RECIPIENTS

State Leadership Personnel	No. Mailed	No. Returned	% Returned
State Directors of Vocational Education	34	22	64.7%
State Directors of Special Education	35	27	77.1
State Directors of Vocational Rehabilitation	34	18	52.9
Professional Association Officers	36	17	42.7
State Board of Education Members	34	18	52.9
Handicapped Advocates and Consumers	32	10	31.3
Teacher Educators	30	24	80.0
State Advisory Councils for Vocational Education	31	16	51.6
TOTAL	266	152	51.1%

Follow-up Activities

The survey was mailed in early October, 1978. Respondents were asked to complete and return the survey within two weeks. As responses were received they were recorded on a control check-off grid, so that the response rate from the individual leadership target audiences could be monitored closely.

Two brief follow-up letters were mailed to correspondents during the first and third weeks of November. A telephone follow-up was initiated by the project staff during the second week of December.

During the telephone follow-up emphasis was placed on contacting leadership personnel from those groups where percentages of response were below 25%.

Major Group Exclusions

Initially, plans for the needs assessment survey included assessing the needs and interests of state leaders from business and industry organizations, labor organizations, and state employment and training councils (CETA). Efforts to locate directories of appropriate and interested personnel at the state level were only moderately successful. Those directories that were obtained were tested with a small-scale survey mailing. The response from this mailing was negligible, so a decision was made to drop these groups from the study.

OUTCOMES

The summary data from the survey reveal a number of interesting findings relative to national leadership training needs. The composite findings for the three major survey questions are presented here for the total sample, as well as for the eight groups of leadership personnel that were surveyed. The composite data tables for the four major survey questions are included in Appendix A.

Exemplary Practices

Respondents were asked to identify exemplary practices or policies that had been implemented in their state to improve and/or expand vocational education opportunities for handicapped learners. On the survey questionnaire a series of 19 policy and practice areas were listed, along with an "other" response category.

Figure 2 provides a rank order of those exemplary practices and policies most frequently identified. Several interesting observations can be made regarding the implementation of exemplary practices and policies.

- The most frequently mentioned exemplary initiatives are concerned with the state education agency's (SEA) policies funding patterns, regulations, and interagency agreements. Better than 50% of the respondents considered their SEA's policies, regulations, and funding patterns to be innovative efforts to improve vocational education for the handicapped.

- University-based teacher education activities were more frequently cited (by 33.3% of the respondents) than local-level or statewide inservice training efforts (29.0% and 27.5% respectively). This suggests that states are further ahead in developing and implementing teacher training efforts that are based in universities and colleges than they are in providing inservice at the local school district level or on a statewide basis.

Figure 2. PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS INDICATING IMPLEMENTATION OF EXEMPLARY POLICIES OR PRACTICES IN THEIR STATE

Exemplary Practice or Policy	Percent Response
State education agency policies	64.5%
State education agency funding patterns	53.3
Education regulations	52.0
Innovative program or service delivery models	48.4
State-level interagency cooperation and collaboration	45.8
State legislation	44.7
Innovative teacher education activities, university/ college level	33.3
Local-level interagency cooperation and collaboration	31.4
Due process guarantees	31.4
Comprehensive Employment and Training Act involvement	30.7
Affirmative action efforts	30.7
Innovative teacher education activities, local level	29.0
Innovative teacher education activities, statewide	27.5
Teacher certification policies/regulations	25.5
State administrative regulations	24.8
Innovative approaches to the industrial/business community	20.9
Civil rights legislation	19.6
Local administrative regulations	13.7
Innovative consumer interaction	6.5

- Teacher certification policies/regulations were cited less frequently than teacher education efforts which suggests that states have not made substantial changes in certification to respond to new thrusts in the preservice and inservice preparation of personnel to provide vocational education to handicapped learners.

- While P.L. 94-142 requires the involvement of parents and advocates of handicapped students in educational placement and planning, only 6.5% of the respondents indicated that an innovative consumer involvement policy or practice existed in their state. It would appear that this area of policy development has been grossly overlooked in most states and requires immediate attention.

- Since 1977 the U.S. Office of Education has placed considerable emphasis on interagency collaboration and cooperation (DHEW Memorandum on Interagency Cooperation, no date). While states have had interagency agreements between vocational education, special education, and vocational rehabilitation for several years, only 45.8% of the respondents felt they had an exemplary state-level cooperation. Considerably fewer respondents (31.4%) cited exemplary interagency efforts at the local level.

Perceived Importance of Selected State Agencies

An awareness of the role and importance of selected state agencies is essential to the development of vocational education opportunities for the handicapped. In each state a number of agencies, associations, and organizations are usually involved. The survey asked each respondent to rate the importance of each agency and organization presented in a list of 19. Figure 3 presents the rank ordered mean scores for each organization and agency.

A number of observations can be drawn:

- The three most critical and influential agencies appear to be the State Offices/Divisions of Vocational Education, Special Education, and Vocational Rehabilitation. These agencies are directly responsible for the administration of the three major federal-state programs affecting the delivery of vocational programming for handicapped learners.

Figure 3. PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF SELECTED STATE-LEVEL AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR HANDICAPPED PERSONS
(Mean Scores)

Agencies/Organizations	Mean Score
State Director of Vocational Education	2.65
State Director of Special Education	2.54
State Director of Vocational Rehabilitation	2.35
State Board of Education	2.31
State Advisory Council for Vocational Education	2.25
State Legislature	2.13
Teacher Educators	2.03
State Advisory Panel for the Handicapped	1.95
Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped	1.76
Administrators of Higher Education	1.66
State Manpower Services Council (CETA)	1.65
Vocational Education Professional Associations	1.55
Consumer, Parent, or Advocacy Organization	1.50
Special Education Professional Associations	1.42
Professional Association, General	1.25
Vocational Rehabilitation Professional Associations	1.19
Major Employers	.91
Labor Organizations	.85
Business/Industry Organizations	.84

1 - Not instrumental
2 - Somewhat instrumental
3 - Very instrumental

- It would appear that at least some State boards of education have been concerned about the interface of vocational and special education. Their increased interest and perceived role importance may be a result of the recent major legislative changes, i.e., P. L. 94-142 and P. L. 94-482.

- Advisory groups, such as the State Advisory Council for Vocational Education, also appear to be of considerable importance in policy formulation. If coordinated policies are to be generated, however, the linkage between the State Advisory Council for Vocational Education, State Advisory Panel for the Handicapped, Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, and the State Employment and Training Council (CETA) will be critical.

- Consumer, parent, and advocacy organizations have yet to be perceived by the respondents as being highly influential. General observations, however, suggest that these groups are becoming increasingly knowledgeable of the need for vocational and career education opportunities for handicapped learners. The inservice training efforts of the American Coalition of Citizens with Disabilities, Closer Look, and the Association of Children with Learning Disabilities is likely to increase the perceived importance of these groups in state-level and local-level planning of vocational education for handicapped learners.

- It would appear that in most states major employers, labor organizations, and business/industry organizations have little impact or involvement in vocational education for the handicapped. While these groups were not included in the survey, their role importance even as perceived by members of the State Advisory Councils for Vocational Education, was still quite low. To insure occupational relevance in vocational programs for the handicapped, it would appear that significantly increased involvement of employers, labor organizations, and business and industry organizations is critically needed.

Leadership Training Needs

The inservice training needs of leadership personnel involved in state-level vocational education for the handicapped appear to be numerous and diverse. One question was included in the survey to identify the major problems, concerns, and inservice session topics of

interest to leadership personnel. In addition, another question addressed "who" could best respond to the identified critical topics. Figure 4 which follows, presents the importance ratings attached to each of the identified inservice topics.

Three topics were clustered as being of major importance --interagency planning, individual education programming, and inservice and preservice personnel development. While a number of national workshops and conferences have been held on these topics over the past couple of years, there still appears to be major, unmet informational needs in these areas. To date, the Leadership Training Institute/Vocational and Special Education has conducted a regional institute focusing on the IEP in vocational education. Institutes responding to the remaining critical topics -- interagency planning and personnel development -- are planned for the 1979-80 school year.

Of the ten topics identified by the respondents, eight were rated above the midpoint of the importance scale. This clearly suggests that leadership personnel envision a large range of topics and concerns as needing to be addressed in their state and national level inservice training and technical assistance programs.

Survey respondents were also asked to indicate which federal agencies or national organizations could best respond to the identified problems and inservice training topics. Figure 5 presents the summary data.

Clearly, the respondents were interested in the "congressional intent" attached to recent and proposed legislation. It could also be concluded that the opportunity to interact with members of Congress in a conference or institute setting is perceived as valuable.

Figure 4. IMPORTANCE OF POTENTIAL LEADERSHIP TRAINING TOPICS
(Mean Scores)

Leadership Training Topic	Mean Score
Interagency planning and service delivery	3.84
Individual education programming	3.84
Inservice and preservice personnel development	3.82
Least restrictive environment programming	3.77
Prevocational education	3.58
Nondiscriminatory assessment and evaluation	3.39
Parent, advocate, and consumer involvement	3.18
Architectural barriers/equipment modifications	3.10
Affirmative action and employment practices	2.88
Child/client find practices	2.41

1 - No interest
3 - Moderate interest
5 - Extreme interest

Figure 5. PERCENT RESPONDENTS INDICATING AN INTEREST IN PRESENTATIONS OR INFORMATION FROM SELECTED FEDERAL AGENCIES AND NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

National Organization/Federal Agency	Percent of Respondents
U.S. Congressman/Senator	37.38
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped	30.7
Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education	26.1
American Vocational Association	26.1
Rehabilitation Services Administration	23.5
President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped	22.2
Council for Exceptional Children	21.6
Major Employers	19.6
National Advisory Council for Vocational Education	19.6
National Rehabilitation Association	18.3
Congressional Staff Member	11.8
Office of Civil Rights, DHEW	8.5

The second tier of responses focused on the agencies responsible for administering the three federal programs -- vocational education, education of the handicapped, and vocational rehabilitation. If one examines the composite data table in Appendix B for this question, it is interesting to note the responses of the three state director groups. More than 45% of the state directors of vocational education, special education, and vocational rehabilitation were interested in presentations by their respective federal agencies. This reflects the continued concern relative to the limited leadership being provided to states by the federal agencies.

Few state leaders appear interested in information or presentations from the DHEW's Office of Civil Rights.

State Directors of Vocational Education

Twenty-two responses were received from the 34 state directors of vocational education who received the survey questionnaire for a 64.7% response rate. In some instances it appears that the surveys were completed by a staff member on behalf of the state director.

A number of exemplary practices and policies were identified as being implemented by the state directors. The most frequently reported exemplary practices included: funding patterns (63.6%), innovative program or service delivery models (63.6%), state-level interagency cooperation (59.1%), and state education agency policies (54.6%).

The state directors of vocational education considered themselves as very instrumental in facilitating the development of vocational education for the handicapped. Their mean importance rating was 2.82 on

a scale of 1 to 3 with "3" being "very instrumental" and 2 being "somewhat instrumental." Other groups that they viewed as important role players included: state directors of special education (2.45), state directors of vocational rehabilitation (2.18), state boards of education (2.14), and state advisory councils for vocational education (2.13).

Two leadership training topics were viewed as extremely critical by the state directors -- interagency planning and service delivery (4.27 on an importance scale of 1 to 5; and inservice and preservice personnel development (4.0).

As a group, the state directors appear to be highly interested in information and leadership from several federal agencies and national organizations. The most frequently mentioned agencies include: Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (45.5%), American Vocational Association (40.9%), Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (27.3%), and the U.S. Congress (27.3%).

State Directors of Special Education

Twenty-seven responses were received from the 35 directors of special education receiving the survey (77.1% response rate). It appears that, in some instances, the survey instrument was completed and returned by a staff member.

State education agency policies were identified by 59.3% of the state directors as representing an exemplary policy initiative in their state. Other frequently mentioned exemplary practices or policies focused on improving vocational education for the handicapped included: state-level cooperation (51.8%), innovative program models (51.8%), and due process guarantees (48.2%).

The state directors see themselves as playing a central role in facilitating the development of vocational education opportunities in their state. On a scale of 1 to 3 with three being "very instrumental," the state directors rated themselves at 2.74. Other personnel and groups that they viewed as important included:

State directors of vocational education	2.67
State directors of vocational rehabilitation	2.56
State board of education	2.44
State legislature	2.41
State advisory council for vocational education	2.30
State advisory panel for the handicapped	2.19
Teacher educators	2.11

From the special education state director's perspective, three critical inservice topics need to be addressed for state leadership personnel involved in vocational education for the handicapped. The topics of major concern include: inservice and preservice personnel development (3.96 mean importance rating on a scale of 1 to 5), individual education programming (3.85) and interagency planning (3.62). The Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Office of Education, the Rehabilitation Services Administration and members of Congress are the three major groups from which the state directors are seeking direction and information on policy matters.

State Directors of Vocational Rehabilitation

Of the 34 state directors who were mailed surveys, 18 responded (52.9%). More than 50% of those responding cited exemplary practices

and policies in their state in the form of state legislation, state education agency policies and regulations, and state education agency funding patterns. Forty-four percent also cited exemplary interagency cooperation efforts to improve vocational education opportunities for the handicapped.

The state directors of vocational rehabilitation perceived the state directors of vocational education and special education to be highly instrumental in the development of vocational education opportunities for the handicapped. They considered themselves as being the third most important state-level agency or organization. The state advisory council for vocational education was perceived as the fourth most influential group.

The state directors of vocational rehabilitation identified two critical topics as needing to be addressed in state or national level inservice efforts that are designed to improve vocational education opportunities for handicapped learners. The issue of "least restrictive environment programming" was rated at 4.28 on an importance scale of 1 to 5. Strategies for interagency planning and service delivery was rated at 4.11. To address these concerns, the state directors were most interested in information and insights from members of the U.S. Congress, the Rehabilitation Services Administration, and the National Rehabilitation Association.

Professional Association Officers

A sample of 36 state association presidents of the American Vocational Association, Council for Exceptional Children, and the National Rehabilitation Counseling Association were mailed questionnaires.

Seventeen useable questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 47.2%. The sample included twelve state association presidents from each of the three groups.

Over 70% of the professional association officers considered their state education agency's policies regarding vocational education for the handicapped to be exemplary. In their view, the state directors of special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation, and the state advisory council for vocational education were the most influential agents in developing or expanding vocational education opportunities for handicapped students.

State Board of Education Members

Responses were returned by 18 of the 34 state board of education members who received the survey. In comparison to the other respondent groups, the state board members rated their states extremely high in the number and type of existing exemplary practices or policies. For example, 83.3% of the state board members felt they had exemplary state education agency policies; 61.1% felt that their state regulations were exemplary. More than 50% also cited as innovative their program delivery models, funding, patterns and state-level interagency cooperation efforts.

The state boards of education viewed the state directors of vocational education and special education as being equally instrumental in developing vocational education opportunities for handicapped students (both were rated at 2.63 on a 1 to 3 point importance scale). They viewed themselves (i.e., state boards of education) as also playing a critical role (2.63), as well as state directors of vocational rehabilitation (2.41).

As far as critical issues for leadership training are concerned, the state board members are particularly interested in concerns related to individual education programming and interagency planning. Interestingly, more than 40% of the state board of education members were looking to the Council for Exceptional Children for information from a national level. More than 36% were interested in the directives of the two major federal education bureaus -- the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped and the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education.

Handicapped Advocates and Consumers

Only 10 useable surveys were returned by the 32 representatives of consumer and advocacy organizations. A word of caution is included here to alert the reader to the limited generalizability of this small sample of respondents. Half of the respondents indicated that their state legislation had created some exemplary policies and practices related to vocational education for the handicapped. Forty percent (40%) also cited exemplary efforts in development of state education agency policies, regulations, innovative program models, and state-level interagency cooperation.

The state boards of education and the state directors of vocational education were regarded as the most influential groups in the development and expansion of vocational education opportunities for handicapped learners. Interestingly, they rated themselves (i.e., consumer, parent, or advocacy organizations) as less than "somewhat instrumental" in statewide efforts to improve vocational programming for the handicapped.

The handicapped advocates are vitally concerned about two major issues relative to vocational education -- interagency planning and service delivery and least restrictive environment programming. To respond to these concerns and others, the handicapped advocates are looking for information and guidance from the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped and the Rehabilitation Services Administration.

Teacher Educators

Twenty-four of the 30 teacher educators receiving the needs assessment questionnaire returned useable surveys representing an 80% return rate.

Those teacher educators responding reported a very high degree of implementation of exemplary practices and policies. Seventy-five percent felt that their state had implemented some innovative teacher education activities in colleges and universities. More than 60% of the teacher educators felt that their states had implemented some exemplary state education agency policies, regulations, and funding patterns. More than 50% of those responding cited exemplary efforts in state legislation and local teacher education activities.

In their view, teacher educators perceived the state directors of vocational education and special education as having major leadership roles in facilitating the development of vocational education opportunities for handicapped learners.

Not surprisingly, the teachers educators considered inservice and preservice personnel development to be the most critical leadership training need. They also rated individualized education programming as

a second, high-level need. Relative to the identified needs, the teacher educators were seeking information from a variety of national organizations and federal agencies. Fifty percent of the respondents mentioned the American Vocational Association as a critical information source. Forty-five percent were interested in the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped's perspective, while 41.7% were also interested in hearing from a U.S. Congressman or Senator and the Council for Exceptional Children.

State Advisory Councils for Vocational Education

The surveys were mailed to the executive directors of 31 state advisory councils for vocational education. Sixteen returned the completed questionnaire for a response rate of 51.6%. In some instances the questionnaires were completed by the executive directors while in other situations they were completed by staff or members of the council.

The respondents felt quite positive about the implementation of exemplary policies or practices within their state. More than 80% felt they had established some exemplary state education agency policies. Seventy-five percent felt they had exemplary state legislation.

They view the state director of vocational education as being the key figure in facilitating the development of vocational education opportunities for the handicapped (rated at 2.69 on an importance scale of 1 to 3). The state directors of special education and vocational rehabilitation were rated similarly at 2.44, and are considered to be the second most critical factors.

The state advisory councils considered "least restrictive environment programming" as the most critical issue requiring inservice leadership training. Prevocational education and affirmative action/ employment practices were also considered important training topics.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This national needs assessment survey addressed three central questions concerning the development of vocational education opportunities for the handicapped at the state level. More specifically, the survey addressed the level of implementation of exemplary policies and practices, the importance of selected agencies and organizations in program development, and the inservice training needs of state leaders.

The data clearly document earlier suggestions by Clark and Evans (1976), Brock (1977), and others that the national state-of-the-art of vocational education for the handicapped is still in its early stages of development. Generally, less than 40% of the state leaders who responded to the survey were able to cite exemplary practices or policies as existing within their state. Major efforts in the form of research and development projects, personnel development activities (e.g., conferences, workshops, institutes), and technical assistance will continue to be critically needed at all levels. In addition, expanded and extensive efforts are needed to disseminate and install many of the exemplary practices, policies, and products that have been developed to date.

The following recommendations are presented for a variety of readers, including policy-making personnel at the local, state, and federal levels, teacher trainers, researchers, professional associations, and others.

1. One major area of policy development appears to have been significantly neglected. Exemplary policies and practices focused on involving handicapped persons and advocates in

the implementation of vocational education are nearly non-existant at the state level. State leaders need to initiate the development of policies that provide expanded avenues for involving parents of handicapped students and handicapped advocates in the planning of vocational education. State-wide and local public awareness and information campaigns are needed to inform parents of vocational education opportunities. Program improvement funds should be expanded to develop models for parent, advocate, and consumer involvement. Once the models are developed, comprehensive in-service training and dissemination efforts will be needed.

2. It also appears that a number of programmatic components need additional implementation policies. Less than 25% of the respondents were able to cite innovative policies or practices relative to: (1) local administrative regulations, (2) civil rights legislation, (3) involvement of the industrial/ business community, and (4) state administrative regulations.

Efforts must be initiated by state education agencies to expand and refine administrative regulations (e.g., guidelines for developing local vocational education programs) that appropriately address serving handicapped youth in vocational education programs. Similar efforts should be made by local school boards to insure that administrative regulations reflect full vocational education opportunities for the handicapped.

Expanded efforts should be made to inform state and local leaders of the civil rights legislation and litigation that impacts upon vocational education for the handicapped (e.g.,

the Office of Civil Rights "Guidelines for Eliminating Discrimination and Denial of Services on the Basis of Race, Color, National Origin, Sex, and Handicap," Federal Register, Vol. 44, No. 56, March 21, 1979).

Finally, efforts are needed to get the business and industrial sector more involved in programming at the national, state, and local levels. As the recipients of the products of vocational education, the employment sector must be intimately involved in the planning and design of vocational programs serving handicapped students. Models and inservice training for local advisory committee development and operation are needed. Cooperative efforts in the form of conferences, seminars, and special projects between groups such as the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, state chamber of commerce, professional education associations, and state education and rehabilitation agencies are critically needed.

3. The survey data indicate that several states have developed exemplary practices and policies for funding, state regulations, and state education agency policies. Also innovative program models were also cited frequently. Research and evaluation projects are needed to document the effectiveness of these existing programs, policies, and practices. Those that demonstrate data-based positive impacts should be disseminated extensively.

4. To date, major investments have been made at the national and state levels in developing and expanding teacher education activities. Interestingly, only one-third of the respondents cited innovative teacher education activities as being implemented in their state. Major investments continue to be needed in this area with special attention being paid to local-level and coordinated state-wide teacher education projects.
5. The survey data revealed that among state-level organizations and agencies, state directors of vocational education, special education, and vocational rehabilitation were perceived as most instrumental in the development of vocational education opportunities for the handicapped. While state directors and their staffs are considered highly instrumental, there are few formal inservice or professional communication systems that exist to help these leaders keep abreast of new legislative developments, research, program models developed in other states, policy interpretations from other states, or emerging trends. Expanded inservice and technical assistance leadership is needed by states from the new Department of Education.
6. A greater overall balance in leadership among state agencies and organizations must be achieved. While the state directors and their agencies are considered highly instrumental in developing vocational education opportunities, consumer and parent organizations and business, industry, and labor groups are considered relatively unimportant and apparently non-involved. Awareness training programs are urgently

needed to get these groups more involved in the planning and expansion of vocational education programming for handicapped learners.

7. The 153 state leadership personnel that responded to the survey outlined a number of critical inservice training needs for state leaders. Short-term training institutes are needed that focus upon: (1) interagency planning and service delivery, (2) individual education programming, (3) inservice and preservice personnel development, (4) least restrictive environment programming, and (5) prevocational education. Presentations and information from congressional representatives and the U.S. Office of Education are perceived as most valuable by state leaders.

REFERENCES

Brock, R. J. Preparing Vocational and Special Education Personnel to Work with Special Needs Students: State of Art, 1977. Menomonie: University of Wisconsin-Stout, 1977.

Clark, G. M. and Evans, R. N. Preparing Vocational and Special Education Personnel to Work with Special Needs Students: A State of the Art in 1977. In Albright, L. and Clark, G. M. Preparing Vocational and Special Education Personnel to Work with Special Needs Students: A Teacher Education Resource Guide. Urbana: Bureau of Educational Research, University of Illinois, 1977.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Memorandum on the Development of Formal Cooperative Agreements Between Special Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and Vocational Education Programs to Maximize Services to Handicapped Individuals, n.d.

Federal Register, Education of Handicapped Children. Volume 42, Number 163, August 23, 1977. (Regulations implementing P.L. 94-142.

Federal Register, Nondiscrimination on Basis of Handicap. Volume 42, Number 86, May 4, 1977. (Regulations implementing Section 504 of P.L. 93-112).

Federal Register, Vocational Education Programs-Guidelines for Eliminating Discrimination and Denial of Services on the Basis of Race, Color, National Origin, Sex, and Handicap. Volume 44, Number 56, March 21, 1979.

General Accounting Office. Training Educators for the Handicapped: A Need to Redirect Federal Programs. Washington, D.C.: Comptroller General of the United States, 1976.

Griffin, G., et al. The Training of Professionals in Vocational Education for the Handicapped. Arlington, Virginia: Teacher Education/ Special Education, 1978.

Howard, R. Vocational Education of Handicapped Youth: State of the Art. Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Boards of Education, 1979.

Olympus Research Corporation. An Assessment of Voational Education Programs for the Handicspped Under Part B of the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act. Salt Lake City, Utah: Author, 1974.

Phelps, L. A., et al. Vocational Education for Special Needs Students: Competencies and Models for Personnel Preparation. Urbana: Bureau of Educational Research, University of Illinois, 1976.

APPENDIX A:

Composite Data Tables

COMPOSITE DATA TABLE I:
Percent of Respondents Indicating Implementation
of Exemplary Practices or Policies in Their State

Exemplary Practices or Policies	State Directors of Voc Ed	State Directors of Sp Ed	State Directors of Voc Rehab	Profes-sional Assoc Officers	State Board of Ed Members	Handicapd Consumers and Advocates	Teacher Educators	St Adv Council for Voc Ed	Total
State legislation	22.7	29.6	50.0	41.2	44.4	50.0	58.3	75.0	44.7
State education agency policies	54.6	59.3	55.6	70.6	83.3	40.0	66.7	81.25	64.5
Education regulations	36.4	44.4	66.7	41.2	61.1	40.0	62.5	62.5	52.0
State education agency funding patterns	63.6	44.4	55.6	47.1	50.0	20.0	62.5	68.8	53.3
Innovative teacher education activities									
Local	27.3	18.5	33.3	35.3	00.0	30.0	58.3	25.0	29.0
Statewide	27.3	40.7	11.1	41.2	10.5	20.0	37.5	18.8	27.5
University/College	31.8	22.2	16.7	29.4	31.6	30.0	75.0	18.8	33.3
Innovative program or service delivery models	63.6	51.8	38.9	35.3	57.9	40.0	50.0	37.5	48.4
Innovative approaches to the industrial/business community	9.1	18.5	22.2	29.4	10.5	20.0	25.0	37.5	20.9
Innovative consumer interaction	9.1	7.4	5.6	17.7	00.0	10.0	4.2	00.0	6.5
Interagency cooperation and collaboration									
Local	36.4	22.2	27.8	35.3	36.8	30.0	37.5	25.0	31.4
State-level	59.1	51.8	44.4	35.3	52.6	40.0	33.3	43.8	45.8
Due process guarantees	13.6	48.2	11.1	41.2	15.8	20.0	45.8	43.8	31.4
Affirmative action efforts	31.8	33.3	33.3	29.4	15.8	60.0	29.8	25.0	30.7
Local administrative regulations	9.1	14.8	00.0	23.5	10.5	10.0	20.8	18.8	13.7
Teacher certification policies/ regulations	18.2	40.7	5.6	23.5	21.1	20.0	41.7	18.8	25.5
State administrative regulations	31.8	22.2	16.7	23.5	21.1	20.0	25.0	37.5	24.8
Civil rights legislation	13.6	14.8	27.8	17.7	00.0	30.0	33.3	25.0	19.6
CETA	22.7	29.6	33.3	52.9	15.8	30.0	37.5	25.0	30.7

COMPOSITE DATA TABLE II:
Perceived Importance of Selected State-Level Agencies/
Organizations in Facilitating the Development of
Vocational Education for Handicapped Persons
(mean scores)

Agencies/Organizations	State Directors of Voc Ed	State Directors of Sp Ed	State Directors of Voc Rehab	Profes-sional Assoc Officers	State Board of Ed Members	Handicapd Consumers and Advocates	Teacher Educators	St Adv Council for Voc Ed	Total
Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped	1.45	1.81	1.83	1.65	1.79	2.10	1.87	1.81	1.76
State Director of Vocational Education	2.82	2.67	2.83	2.35	2.68	2.80	2.52	2.69	2.65
State Director of Special Education	2.45	2.74	2.67	2.41	2.68	2.50	2.48	2.44	2.54
State Director of Vocational Rehabilitation	2.18	2.56	2.56	2.18	2.42	2.30	2.22	2.44	2.35
State Board of Education	2.14	2.44	2.44	1.71	2.63	2.50	2.29	2.38	2.31
State Legislature	1.68	2.41	2.39	1.76	2.16	2.30	2.21	2.13	2.13
Professional Associations	1.00	1.33	1.67	.88	1.21	1.30	1.46	1.13	1.25
Special education	1.41	1.74	1.44	1.29	.79	1.10	1.96	1.19	1.42
Vocational education	1.77	1.67	1.39	1.53	1.11	1.40	1.83	1.44	1.55
Vocational rehabilitation	.95	1.22	1.56	1.24	.89	1.40	1.21	1.19	1.19
Consumer, Parent or Advocacy Organizations	1.18	1.52	1.89	1.53	1.68	1.30	1.83	.87	1.50
Business/Industry Organizations	.55	.59	1.17	1.00	.95	.90	.75	1.06	.84
Major Employers	.95	.89	1.44	1.12	.74	.70	.83	.50	.91
Labor Organizations	.55	.81	1.56	1.12	.84	.60	.71	.67	.85
Teacher Educators	1.95	2.11	2.39	1.82	1.95	1.80	2.29	1.80	2.03
Administrators of Higher Education	1.45	1.85	1.78	1.47	1.63	1.50	1.96	1.47	1.66
State Advisory Council for Vocational Education	2.13	2.30	2.50	2.00	2.37	2.10	2.25	2.40	2.25
State Advisory Panel for the Handicapped	1.64	2.19	1.83	1.94	1.74	1.90	2.25	2.07	1.95
State Manpower Services Council (CETA)	1.41	1.63	1.61	1.71	1.74	1.80	1.79	1.73	1.65

1 - Not instrumental
2 - Somewhat instrumental
3 - Very instrumental

COMPOSITE DATA TABLE III:
Importance of Potential Leadership Training Topics
(mean scores)

Proposed Leadership Training Topics	State Directors of Voc Ed	State Directors of Sp Ed	State Directors of Voc Rehab	Profes-sional Assoc Officers	State Board of Ed Members	Handicapd Consumers and Advocates	Teacher Educators	St Adv Council for Voc Ed	Total
Affirmative action and employment practices	2.45	2.63	3.06	2.53	2.42	3.80	3.13	3.63	2.88
Individual education programming	3.82	3.85	3.89	3.76	4.11	3.40	4.08	3.50	3.84
Inservice and preservice personnel development	4.0	3.96	3.28	3.71	3.74	3.60	4.42	3.38	3.82
Interagency planning and service delivery	4.27	3.62	4.11	3.12	4.0	4.70	3.92	3.25	3.84
Child/client final practices	2.05	2.33	3.06	2.29	2.84	2.40	2.33	2.00	2.41
Architectural barriers/equipment modifications	2.77	3.11	3.39	2.59	2.63	3.60	3.46	3.50	3.10
Parent, advocate, and consumer involvement	2.73	3.11	3.50	3.29	3.21	3.60	3.33	2.88	3.18
Nondiscriminatory assessment and evaluation	3.05	3.30	3.50	3.18	3.16	3.90	3.92	3.31	3.39
Least restrictive environment programming	3.86	3.44	4.28	3.35	3.47	4.10	4.04	3.81	3.77
Prevocational education	3.55	3.48	3.39	3.41	3.32	3.70	4.08	3.69	3.58

1 - No interest
3 - Moderate interest
5 - Extreme interest

COMPOSITE DATA TABLE IV:
Percent of Respondents Indicating an Interest in Presentations or Information from Selected National Organizations and Federal Agencies

National Organizations and Federal Agencies	State Directors of Voc Ed	State Directors of Sp Ed	State Directors of Voc Rehab	Profes-sional Assoc Officers	State Board of Ed Members	Handicapd Consumers and Advocates	Teacher Educators	St Adv Council for Voc Ed	Total
U.S. Congressman/Senator	27.3	40.7	61.1	35.3	26.3	30.0	41.7	31.3	37.3
Congressional Staff Member	18.2	14.8	22.2	23.5	00.0	00.0	4.2	6.3	11.8
Rehabilitation Services Administration	13.6	25.9	50.0	17.7	15.8	40.0	16.7	18.8	23.5
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped	27.3	29.6	22.2	35.3	36.8	10.0	45.8	25.0	30.7
Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education	45.5	14.8	22.2	17.7	36.8	00.0	37.5	18.8	26.1
Office of Civil Rights, DHEW	4.6	7.4	5.6	11.8	10.5	10.0	16.7	00.0	8.5
National Advisory Council on Vocational Education	18.2	18.5	11.1	11.8	26.3	00.0	16.7	50.0	19.6
Council for Exceptional Children	13.6	18.5	5.6	29.4	42.1	00.0	41.7	6.2	21.6
National Rehabilitation Association	18.1	18.5	44.4	00.0	15.8	30.0	12.5	12.5	18.3
American Vocational Association	40.9	18.5	11.1	17.7	26.3	00.0	50.0	25.0	26.1
Major Employers	22.7	22.2	22.2	23.5	5.3	20.0	33.3	18.7	19.6
President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped	13.6	18.5	22.2	17.7	21.1	40.0	20.8	12.5	22.2

APPENDIX B:

Survey Instrument

LEADERSHIP TRAINING NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY

1. Name of person completing this form: _____

2. Position: _____ Office phone: ( ) _____ - _____

3. Office address: _____

city _____ *state* _____ *zip code* _____

4. In your state, several agencies/organizations may be instrumental in facilitating the development or delivery of vocational education for handicapped persons. On the scale below, please indicate your perceptions of the relative importance of the agencies/ organizations which are listed by circling the correct number.

1 - Not instrumental 2 - Somewhat instrumental 3 - Very instrumental

1 2 3 Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped

1 2 3 State Director of Vocational Education

1 2 3 State Director of Special Education

1 2 3 State Director of Vocational Rehabilitation

1 2 3 State Board of Education

1 2 3 State Legislature

1 2 3 Professional Associations

1 2 3 Special Education (Name: _____)

1 2 3 Vocational Education (Name: _____)

1 2 3 Vocational Rehabilitation (Name: _____)

1 2 3 Other (Name: _____)

1 2 3 Consumer, Parent or Advocacy Organization (Name: _____)

1 2 3 Business/Industry Organization (Name: _____)

1 2 3 Major Employer (Name: _____)

1 2 3 Labor Organization (Name: _____)

1 2 3 Teacher Educators

1 2 3 Administrators of Higher Education

1 2 3 State Advisory Council for Vocational Education

1 2 3 State Advisory Panel for the Handicapped

1 2 3 State Manpower Services Council

1 2 3 Others *(please list)* _____

_____

_____

5. In what areas have exemplary practices and/or policies been implemented in your state to improve and/or expand vocational education for the handicapped? (Please check as many as are appropriate.)

a. ___ State legislation

b. ___ State education agency policies

c. ___ Education regulations

d. ___ State education agency funding patterns

e. ___ Innovative teacher education activities

1. ___ Local

2. ___ Statewide

3. ___ University/college

f. ___ Innovative program or service delivery models

g. ___ Innovative approaches to the industrial/business community

h. ___ Innovative consumer interaction

i. ___ Interagency cooperation and collaboration

1. ___ Local

2. ___ State-level

j. ___ Due process guarantees

k. ___ Affirmative action efforts

l. ___ Local administrative regulations

m. ___ Teacher certification policies/ regulations

n. ___ State administrative regulations

o. ___ Civil rights legislation

p. ___ CETA

q. ___ Other (*please specify*) _____

It will be greatly appreciated if you will return, with the questionnaire, any documents, memoranda, pamphlets, etc. which are descriptive of the above. You may wish to write a brief explanatory statement which would aid the staff in selecting materials and individuals for presentation or involvement in the LTI's.

6. Presented below is a list of possible topics or themes for the LTI's. Please circle the number corresponding to the degree of your interest in each topic.

	No Interest		Moderate Interest		Extreme Interest
a. Affirmative action and employment practices	1	2	3	4	5
b. Individual education programming	1	2	3	4	5
c. Inservice and preservice personnel development	1	2	3	4	5
d. Interagency planning and service delivery	1	2	3	4	5
e. Child/client find practices	1	2	3	4	5
f. Architectural barriers/equipment modifications	1	2	3	4	5
g. Parent, advocate, and consumer involvement	1	2	3	4	5
h. Non-discriminatory assessment and evaluation	1	2	3	4	5
i. Least restrictive environment programming	1	2	3	4	5
j. Prevocational education	1	2	3	4	5
k. Other topics (*please describe*)					
_____	1	2	3	4	5
_____	1	2	3	4	5
_____	1	2	3	4	5

7. From which national organizations and leaders (by name or title) would you most like to hear at an LTI?

   a. Congressman/Senator (Nominee: _____)

   b. Congressional Staff Member (Nominee: _____)

   c. Rehabilitation Services Administration (Nominee: _____)

   d. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (Nominee: _____)

   e. Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (Nominee: _____)

   f. Office of Civil Rights, DHEW (Nominee: _____)

   g. National Advisory Council on Vocational Education (Nominee: _____)

   h. Council for Exceptional Children (Nominee: _____)

   i. National Rehabilitation Association (Nominee: _____)

   j. American Vocational Association (Nominee: _____)

   k. Major Employers (Nominee: _____)

   l. President's Committee on Employment for the Handicapped (Nominee: _____)

   m. Other (Nominee: _____)

8. Will you be able to attend an Institute held in your DHEW region if per diem and lodging, but not travel, are provided by the Leadership Training Institute project?

   a. Definitely yes

   b. Probably

   c. Unlikely

   d. Definitely no

9. What major outcomes would you expect from participation in a LTI? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please enclose the survey and any related materials which you wish to forward in the postage-paid, return envelope. Thank you.